

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 2-4, 6, 9, 11 and 20-47 have been cancelled, claims 1, 7, 10, and 14 have been amended, and claims 48 and 49 have been added. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12-19, 48, and 49 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

In the Office Action at page 4, the Examiner indicated that claims 5, and 11-12 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The subject matter of claim 11 has been incorporated into amended independent claim 1 and claim 11 has been cancelled.

AMENDMENT OF CLAIMS 7, 10, AND 14

Claims 7, 10, and 14 have been amended only to correct informalities in the claims.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

In the Office Action at page 2, numbered items 3-4, claims 1, 7, 8, 10, and 13-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Canon. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite "a resin layer formed on the surface of the base member and comprising a cured product of a photosensitive resin composition having a polyfunctional (meth)acrylate" and "said polyfunctional (meth)acrylate has two or more benzene ring structures in one molecule." Thus, independent claim 1 has been amended to include the feature previously found in dependent claim 11, the subject matter of which the Examiner has indicated as allowable. Amended independent claim 1 also includes antecedent basis for the "polyfunctional (meth)acrylate," which was previously found in claim 8, from which

claim 11 depended. Dependent claim 11 has been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the prior art for at least the same reasons as the allowable subject matter of cancelled claim 11 and, therefore, is in condition for allowance. Claims 7, 8, 10, and 13-18 depend, either directly or indirectly, from amended independent claim 1 and, therefore, patentably distinguish over the prior art for at least the same reasons as amended independent claim 1 and are also in condition for allowance.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action at page 3, numbered items 7 and 8, claims 1 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Fong, et al. The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

As indicated above, independent claim 1 has been amended to include subject matter that the Examiner has indicated as allowable. This subject matter was previously found in dependent claim 11. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the prior art and is in condition for allowance. Claim 16 depends directly from amended independent claim 1 and, therefore, patentably distinguishes over the prior art for at least the same reasons as amended independent claim 1 and is also in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action at pages 3-4, numbered items 9 and 10, claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Canon in view of Sato. The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 19 depends indirectly from amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claim 19 patentably distinguishes over the prior art for at least the same reasons as amended independent claim 1 and, therefore, is in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

May 2, 2005

By:

David M. Pitcher
David M. Pitcher
Registration No. 25,908

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501